

REMARKS

Examiner Srilakshmi is thanked for her time and consideration during the Telephone Interview of February 11, 2007. During the Interview Applicant's undersigned representative provided some proposed claim amendments intended to overcome the pending rejections and further the prosecution in the application. Examiner Srilakshmi made some suggestions for claim amendments as well. The present Amendment reflects the discussion of the Telephone Interview. Favorable reconsideration of the present patent application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

In this Amendment claims 23, 26, 28-31, 34, 37, 41-44, 46-47 and 49 are amended, claims 56-58 are added, and no claims are canceled (claims 1-22, 24-25, 33, 35-36 and 45 were previously canceled). As a result, claims 23, 26-32, 34, 37-44 and 46-58 are now pending in the application.

In the final Office Action of October 18, 2007, claims 23, 32, 34, 41 and 47-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of U.S. Patent 5,063,289 (Jasinski) further in view of U.S. Patent 5,376,970 (Amano). Claim 39 is rejected under §103 in view of Jasinski further in view of Amano and yet further in view of so-called applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA). Claims 26, 37 and 42 are rejected under §103(a) in view of Jasinski further in view of Amano and yet further in view of U.S. Patent 6,188,387 (Hall). Claims 27-31, 38, 40, 43-44 and 46 are rejected under §103(a) in view of Jasinski further in view of Amano and yet further in view of U.S. Patent 5,900,867 (Schindler). These rejections are obviated in view of the pending claim amendments.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection of Dependent claims 51, 53 and 55

Although the §103 rejection in view of Jasinski and Amano is obviated in view of the present claim amendments, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 51, 53 and 55 in view of the Jasinski / Amano hypothetical combination could not be properly maintained, for at least the following reasons.

Dependent claims 51 and 53 each recite “wherein said computer comprises a screen configured to display a cursor controlled by said cursor control device,” and claim 55 recites a similar feature. In the rejection of independent claims 23, 34 and 41 the Office Action cites the Amano patent to purportedly overcome acknowledged deficiencies of the first cited Jasinski patent, contending that monitor 10 of Amano is a multimedia device.¹ In the rejection of dependent claims 51, 53 and 55 the Office Action contends that the monitor 10 of Amano is a computer screen that displays a cursor. It is respectfully submitted that these contentions of the Office conflict with each other. Consequently, it is believed that the pending final rejection cannot be maintained.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection of Dependent claims 51, 53 and 55

The §103 rejections of claims 23, 26-32, 34, 37-44 and 46-52 in view of the various hypothetical combinations of Jasinski, Amano, Hall, Schindler and so-called AAPA are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons. Rather than repeat the arguments of the previously filed Amendments, these arguments are incorporated by reference herein.

The Office Action cites the Jasinski patent for its description of a mouse, acknowledging that Jasinski does not teach a multimedia control device. The Office Action then cites the

Amano patent, contending that Amano overcomes the deficiencies of Jasinski. Applicants respectfully disagree with this contention. The Amano patent does involve a remote control device 33 as mentioned in the Office Action. However, Amano's remote control device is connected directly to a multimedia device itself, television tuner 20, rather than being connected to a computer which in turn is connected to or incorporates a multimedia device. The microcomputer 30 of Amano is part of the television tuner 20, which is a type of multimedia device. The microcomputer 30 is not a computer connected to or incorporating a multimedia device. The connection between Amano's remote control device 33 and television tuner 20 is a connection between a remote control device and a multimedia device. Therefore, the hypothetical combination of Jasinski and Amano does not teach or suggest "a connection that transmits signals generated by the mouse button, the cursor control device and the multimedia audio control device to the computer," as recited in claims 1 and 41, as amended herein. The hypothetical Jasinski / Amano combination also does not disclose or suggest "an audio control for controlling audio of the multimedia device such that actuation of the control causes the computer to directly control the audio of the multimedia device" as recited in claim 34, as amended herein. The third and fourth cited documents to Hall and Schindler do not overcome the deficiencies of the hypothetical Jasinski / Amano combination.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Jasinski, Amano, Hall and Schindler, either taken singly or in hypothetical combination, do not teach or suggest the features of the claimed invention. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

¹ Office Action of Oct. 18, 2007, page 3.

Claim Amendments

The claim set includes a number of amendments further specifying the metes and bounds of applicant's invention, for example, that the multimedia control is a multimedia "audio" control. In addition, claims 56-58 are added. Claim 56 recites "wherein the multimedia audio control device is configured to control volume of the multimedia device, and wherein the multimedia device includes a volume control button configured to control the volume independent of said multimedia audio control device." Claims 57-58 contain similar recitations. It is respectfully submitted that the prior art does not teach or suggest these features of the claimed invention.

Deposit Account Authorization / Provisional Time Extension Petition

It is believed that the RCE Transmittal attends to the required claim fees, and the accompanying petition for a one-month extension of time is sufficient for this filing. However, to the extent necessary, a provisional petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 50-0439 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. However, in the event there are any unresolved issues, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact applicant's representative, Scott Richardson, by telephone at (571) 748-4765 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,



Scott Charles Richardson
Scott Charles Richardson
Reg. No. 43,436

The Brevetto Law Group, PLLC
107 S. West Street, #765
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Date: February 13, 2008